



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Hebrew (see Uhlemann, §§ 85. 4: α , β , and 62, 2). In this language the latter of two perfects without a connective may denote the purpose of the former (Uhlemann, § 60. 5, b ; Bernstein's *Chrestomathia Syriaca*, p. 56, ll. 3 and 12, and p. 78, l. 3).]

H. G. MITCHELL,

Boston.

On the Source of the Name יהוה.—Since the theory that the idea in the tetragrammaton as already used by Moses had undergone the change of a development, might find some support in the claim that the name *Yahweh* has been taken from other religious systems, it will be necessary briefly to explain the opinions of scholars, those of our day especially, on this subject, as also what seems to be the correct view concerning it. Since Israel could have borrowed the name in question only through the presupposed or real, direct or indirect, connection with other nations, it will be best to consider in order the different nations who are claimed to have made use of the name *Yahweh*.

That the Indo-Europeans have this Old Testament appellation for God in the word *Jovis*, is considered by v. Bohlen (*Gen.* p. ciii), Vatke (*Bibl. Theol.* p. 672), and J. G. Müller (*Die Semiten, etc.*, p. 163) as "a view not easily to be refuted." But so little direct connection between the Indo-European and the Semitic languages can be pointed out, that it is out of question to find a derivative of the Indo-European *div* (*to shine*) transferred into the Semitic; but rather must the name of *Yahweh*, used by one of the Semitic nations (Israel), be derived from a Semitic verb. Hitzig endeavored to prove for יהוה, not an etymological and linguistic, but rather an ideal and historico-religious connection with the Indo-European, by saying: "From all appearances, the word *Yahweh* has come from *Astuds*, i. e., *astuat* = the Existing-one, as in the Armenian language God is called. Moses modeled his name of God after this, but only because his mind was prepared to grasp the idea, and by reflection he was able to understand the truth and depth of the thought in *astuds*." But how is it possible, even if the story concerning the flood shows acquaintance with the Ararat of Armenia (*Gen.* VIII., 4), and even if the oldest traditions of the Hebrews point rather to a direct north-easterly than a south-easterly source, to believe that Moses, while in Egypt, took an Armenian name of God as his model?

If then an Aryan or Japhetic origin of the tetragrammaton is apparently an impossibility, it seems, on the other hand, quite natural, on account of the actual connection between the Hebrews and the Hamitic (*Gen.* x., 8-12) original inhabitants of Babylon, to look for a proto-Chaldaic origin for the (commonly so considered) original form of *Yahweh*, namely *Yau*. This has been done last by Frederick Delitzsch (*Wo lag das Paradies*, p. 158 sq.). But I must on this point express my agreement with the criticism of Friedrich Philippi (*Ztschrift fuer Völkerpsychologie*, 1883, pp. 175-190). The latter has shown, on the one hand, that Delitzsch is unsuccessful in his attack on the generally accepted view, which takes יהוה to be a Qal form of הוה, and *Yahu*, *Yah*, *Yeho*, *Yo* to be abbreviations of this form, and, on the other hand, that there is no proof for Delitzsch's assertions, that an original *Yau* had been transformed into a *Yahu*; that there had been an Assyrio-Babylonian god named *Yau*; and that there had ever been a Sumerico-Akkadian name *i* for the divinity. According to Schrader (*Keilinschriften u. d. V. T.*, 1883, p. 25) a Hebrew or Assyrian origin of the name יהוה seems not even a possibility. But did not the Hamitic Canaanites, who had em-

igrated from the neighborhood of Babylon and the Erythrian Sea into the Semitic districts, possess the name *Yahweh* in some form? Even if we do find scattered reminiscences of the name, if not in *Κολπία*, yet, e. g., in the name of a Hamitic king (2 Sam. viii., 10, and in cuneiform inscriptions), historically, it is more probable that these latter added the name *Yahweh* to their mythological list. This is also the view of Baudissin (*Studien*, i., p. 223).—Again, another party of the Hamitic nation, namely the Egyptians, are considered as furnishing the model for the word *Yahweh*, both for the word and the idea. The former view is that of Röth, who considers the name *Yahweh* an imitation of *Yoh*, the god of the moon. But as there is no reason why the Hebrews should select from the Egyptian gods just this *Yoh*, and as *Yahweh* stands in no special relation to the moon, this identification must be considered as forced and without ground. The latter view, i. e., a connection between the idea of *Yahweh* and an Egyptian idea, has in a two-fold manner been made the actual source of the tetragrammaton. In the first place, the Old Testament definition of the tetragrammaton, the sentence “I am that I am” (Ex. iii., 14) is considered a translation of an inscription on the Isis temple at Sais reported by Plutarch. It is this (*De Iside*, ch. 9). *Τὸ ἐν Σάει τῆς Ἀθηνῶς ἑδος ἐπιγραφὴν εἶχε τοιαύτην: Ἐγὼ εἰμι πᾶν τὸ γεγονὸς καὶ ὄν καὶ ἐσόμενον, καὶ τὸν ἐμὸν πέπλον οὐδεὶς πω θνητὸς ἀπεκάλυψε.* But this inscription “describes the goddess *Neith* as the one that eternally reproduces herself, over against which the idea lying in *Yahweh* is most radically contradictory” (Tholuck). In the second place, the idea expressed in the name *Yahweh* is regarded as a reproduction of the Egyptian *nuk pu nuk*. However, Le Page Renouf (*Vorlesungen*, p. 227) says: “The words *nuk pu nuk* are indeed found in several passages in the Book of the Dead, and it is also true that the word *nuk* is the personal pronoun *I*, and that the demonstrative word *pu* is frequently employed to connect the subject and the predicate of a sentence. But the connection in which the word stands must be looked at, before we can be sure of having a complete sentence before us, especially as *pu* generally stands at the end of a sentence. A careful study of the passages in the Book of the Dead where these words occur, shows us immediately that they contain no mysterious teachings concerning the being of God. In one of these passages (78: 21) the dead person says: ‘I am he that knows the way of *Nu* ;’ at another (31: 4), ‘I am the ancient in the land.’ ‘I am he who is Osiris, the ancient, who looked on his father Seb and his mother Nut on the day of the great slaughter.’ In another account in this book (contained in ch. 96) the words *nuk pu nuk*, disappear, because the report is in the third person. There we read: ‘He is the bull of the field, he is Osiris, who,’ etc.

Or is the name *Yahweh* an original possession of the Semitic family, but belonging to another member than the Israelites? However the opinion of v. d. Alm, Tiele and Stade, that *Yahwe* was originally the name of the god of the Kenites, a member of the Midianites, has no proof whatever for itself. For even though we learn in 1 Chron. ii., 55, that the Kenites are joined with the Rechabites, it is expressly stated in 1 Chron. iv., 10, that the Kenite Jabez, who had settled in Judea, had called upon the name of *Yahweh*. And it must also be accepted in the case of the Rechabite Jonadab (2 Kgs. x., 15 sq.) who had settled in the Northern Kingdom, that he, since a separate motive for his action is nowhere mentioned, maintained his fidelity to the worship of *Yahweh*, which had been adopted by his forefathers, for the same reason that the 7000 Israelites

(1 Kgs. xix., 18) did. The descendants of Jonadab also thus maintain their fidelity only to the God who had been accepted by them (Jer. xxxv.). But in itself it is improbable that the Kenites, who in a political and social view were strangers and metics, and only an element whose presence was permitted, should, from a religious point of view, have been the ruling element from whom the Israelites should have adopted their most precious possession. Is it not, even from the outset, probable that they were the gerim who had adopted the Y a h w e h cultus, and not proselytes, because, by their own voluntary act, they have accepted what others have received from their fathers, and "must first secure in order to possess"—generally the most zealous advocates of the possession?

Over against the favor with which an extra-Israelitish source for the Y a h w e h idea is received by a number of modern scholars, and over against the view that in doing so the true spirit of critical prudence and historical impartiality is evinced, I believe the historical consciousness of the Israelites ought to be thrown into the scales, according to which they regarded the divine appellation in question as their own peculiar property, while they have handed down other religious phenomena as foreign in character. The manner in which this historical consciousness finds its expression is well expounded by Tuch (*Genesis*, 1838, p. xl sq.) in these words: "The non-Israelite cannot know of Y a h w e h, but can have only a corruption of the deity in general. In his mouth the word יהוה would not signify the true God, the Creator of the world and Lord of the nations, but in a one-sided manner, only the God of the Hebrews. Y a h w e h would thus become one of the gods (cf. 1 Kgs. xx., 23, with verse 28). With a clear conception of the difference, the Hebrew avoids the use of the word יהוה both when he speaks to non-Israelites and also when he introduces non-Israelites as speakers, and employs principally the word אלהים. This we find in Judg. i., 7; vii., 14; 1 Sam. iv., 7, 8; Jonah iii., 3; cf. with 5, 8, 9, 10; 1 Sam. xxx., 15; xxxii., 3. It is characteristic that just in these cases the construction of אלהים with the plural (cf. 1 Sam. iv., 8) is generally used, whereby the Israelite narrator entirely places himself on the standpoint of the heathen conception of the divinity. From this standpoint also must be explained the fact that the word יהוה is not used by those animals that are introduced as speaking (cf. Judg. ix., 9, with Gen. iii., 1, sq.)."—Translated from König's "*Die Hauptprobleme der altisraelitischen Religionsgeschichte*, 1884, pp. 29-33."